

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 3-28 were pending and rejected. In this response, no claim has been canceled. Claims 1, 3, 14, and 22 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 and 3-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0087728 to Deshpande, et al. (“Deshpande”) in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0110299 to Larsson, et al. (“Larsson”). In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 3-28 include limitations that are not disclosed or suggested by Deshpande and Larsson, individually or in combination.

Specifically, for example, independent claim 1 as amended includes limitations that a client has capabilities of reconstructing the codestream from a non-JPEG 2000 compliant format into a JPEG 2000 compliant codestream by adjusting values of a variety of markers including at least TLM and PLM markers to reflect the characteristics of the images in view of the JPEG 2000 standard. As a result, an ordinary JPEG 2000 decoder can be used to decode the reconstructed codestream. The support for these limitations can be found throughout the specification of the present application, such as, for example, pages 20-22 of the specification.

It is respectfully submitted that these limitations are absent from Deshpande and Larsson, individually or in combination. None of the clients of Deshpande and Larsson have such capabilities as described above, particularly, the JPEG 2000 codestream reconstruction capabilities. In addition, there is no disclosure or suggestion within Deshpande and Larsson to combine with each other. Even if they were combined, such a combination still lacks the limitations set forth above. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 as amended is patentable over Deshpande and Larsson.

Similarly, independent claims 3, 14, and 22 include limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Thus, for reasons similar to those set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 14, and 22 are patentable over Deshpande and Larsson. Given that the rest of the claims depend from one of the above independent claims, for reasons similar to those set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the rest of the claims are also patentable over Deshpande and Larsson. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call/email the undersigned attorney.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: April 18, 2007

/Kevin G. Shao/
Kevin G. Shao
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,095
kevin_shao@bstz.com

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300